

REMARKS

Applicants have cancelled claims 14-26. Thus, claims 7-13 are pending and presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Response To Rejections Under Section 112

Claims 14-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the Examiner contending these claims as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants have cancelled claims 14-26.

Response To Rejections Under Section 102

Claims 7-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner contending that these claims are anticipated by Woods (USPN 5,369,387).

Regarding to independent claim 7, the Examiner read that Woods discloses the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree as detailed below.

The Examiner contends that Woods discloses “a recess configured to receive lead wires (42, 43) for leading the lead wires to elements inside the vacuum housing”. Applicants respectfully submit that Woods does not disclose a recess and respectfully request the Examiner to identify where Woods discloses this limitation. Applicants also respectfully submit that Woods reference numbers 42 and 43 are not the claimed lead wires, but rather Teflon tubes. Let alone, Woods does not disclose “a recess configured to receive lead wires for leading the lead wires to elements inside the vacuum housing”.

Applicants respectfully submit that Woods does not disclose “a first lead-through module” and respectfully request the Examiner to identify where Woods discloses this limitation. Applicants also respectfully submit that Woods reference number 53 is not claimed first cover plate which is configured to seal the recess in a vacuum-tight manner together with at least a second cover plate 19, but rather a fastening plate to fasten the assembly to the outer shell wall 19. Applicants further respectfully submit that Woods reference number 36 is not claimed first

structural component being configured to be led through at least partially through the recess during assembly of the lead-through module, but rather a central insulating tube. Let alone, Woods does not disclose that “wherein the first structural component has dimensions that define the minimum size of the recess required for assembly and wherein the recess has a minimum size greater than that of the first cover plate”.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7 is patentable. Dependent claims 8-13 are patentable based on their dependency from independent claim 7 as well as based on their own merit. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraws the Section 102 rejection.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims and specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extension of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 18, 2008

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830